

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspio.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/884,600	06/18/2001	Jeff M. Anderson	10011123-1	3353	
7590 08/22/2005 HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY Intellectual Property Administration P.O. Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400			EXAMINER DENNISON, JERRY B		
			2143		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action						
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief						

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/884,600	ANDERSON ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
J. Bret Dennison	2143		

Advisory Action	09/884,600 ANDERSON ET AL.					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	J. Bret Dennison	2143	ı			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence addi	ress			
	THE REPLY FILED 19 July 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
∑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);						
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).						
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ill be entered and an o	explanation of			
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-24</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affida	vit or other evidence is	s necessary			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to c showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar. 10. The first state of the	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ils to provide a 1).			
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attatched.						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(e). Other:						
•		VISTRY PATENT EXAM				
	Ed	HOLOGY CENTER 21	100			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 4-05)

60.2

Applicant argues that "Hussey fails to show or suggest the concept of determining whether a response to a document request is to be transmitted to a third party address or an originator address on a network."

Hussey disclosed a network server that obtains email requests from clients and generates a response email message which is to be issued to whatever email address was designated in the email, whether it is the originator of the corresponding email address or any other email address (Hussey, col. 11, lines 55-67, col. 12, lines 1-10). The server in Hussey does in fact make a determination as to what address/addresses to send the response to, based on the addresses in the email request.

Applicant argues that "Hussey teaches the use of all addresses in the request and avoids the complications of determining specifically where the document is tobe sent".

As shown above, the server in Hussey does in fact make a determination as to what address/addresses to send the response to, based on the addresses in the email request (Hussey, col. 11, lines 55-67, col. 12, lines 1-10). Therefore a determination is made as to secifically where the document is to be sent.

Applicant disagrees that "Hussey teaches or suggests an email response builder that generates a response email message with an attached document".

Hussey disclosed that the server generates a response email in which an attatched file includes all SQL query results, where the attatched file is in a well known format such as spreadsheet or ASCII text (Hussey, col. 7, lines 25-37).